

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_95553
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the spectral response of a monocrystalline silicon solar cell: Under the influence of the variation of the refractive indices of the antireflection materials
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes this manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. Yes. 3. Little bit more comprehension is needed 4. Yes but detailed explanation can increase the quality. 5. Yes. 6. However, the author should study and cite more about the thin film solar cells. The author should connect his work with the CZTS/CIGS solar cells (A heuristic proposition of efficient copper-electrodeposited p-type thin film for CZTS solar cell. In 2017 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE) (pp. 95-99). IEEE). Also it is better have compare the methods of fabrication with others like (Potentiostat Electro-Deposited Cuprous Oxide and Cupric Oxide Thin Films for Photovoltaic Use. International Journal of Automotive and Mechanical Engineering, 16(2), 6624-6633.). another important consideration should be the cost of manufacturing and the author should go through this paper (A cheap way to develop absorber layer of solar cell using CuO thin film. In 2017 4th International Conference on Advances in Electrical Engineering (ICAEE) (pp. 415-420). IEEE).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tazdik Patwary Plateau
Department, University & Country	Missouri University of Science and Technology, United States